

2003 through 2006, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 229, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1527, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under the suspension of the rules, and a final list of those bills will be sent to the Members' offices by the end of this week. Any votes called on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Monday. For Tuesday and the balance of the week, we expect to consider additional bills under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 1904, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003, and the Department of Defense authorization bill.

And, finally, I would like to note for all the Members that we are waiting on Senate action on a variety of issues such as the jobs and growth package and the President's Global AIDS Initiative. Members should be aware that we are likely to be in session Friday next, possibly late into the evening, as we work to resolve these important pieces of legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the leader for his information with respect to our schedule for next week, and when we go in, and the fact that we expect certainly to meet on Friday or perhaps late on Friday.

With respect to the forest bill, Mr. Speaker, what type of rule does the

gentleman anticipate? It is my understanding that an unlimited number of amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules, and I would hope they would be made in order.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Rules on the floor. Obviously we are hopeful that we will have our opportunity to offer our alternatives to this bill. There are obviously some controversial items in it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I will simply say that we just a couple of hours ago completed the hearing portion for consideration of the measure, and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Resources, came forward with a substitute which he asked that we make in order, and we had four other amendments that were proposed, and we are working with Members of the minority right now to see which of the proposals we might be able to accommodate. So we are going to try our darnedest to make sure there are options that our colleagues have as we proceed with this very important piece of legislation, which I am happy to see there is strong bipartisan consensus to move ahead with this bill.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to hear that they are considering the options, but considering the options and approving the options appear to be two different things.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just do not want to predetermine what the Committee on Rules might do as we want the committee to work its will and take into consideration these proposals, and I know the gentleman would not want to predetermine what the Committee on Rules might do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the chairman's appreciation of the vigorous debate and differences that are sometimes debated within the bosom of the Committee on Rules. I remember those same kinds of disputes when we were in the majority. I am aware of the fact, however, that sometimes those vigorous disputes as to what ought to be and ought not to be in the rule are sometimes resolved by leadership suggesting alternatives that then create consensus very quickly. It has been my experience in the past. So I am hopeful that the leadership will work its will on the creation of consensus to allow full consideration.

We are being lighthearted in this effort, but I do not want anybody confused by the lightheartedness, that we feel very, very strongly about having full consideration of the alternatives that we offer, just as the gentleman,

the chairman of the committee, felt so strongly about in 1991, in 1992, in 1993, and 1994 when we were in charge. And I would hope that the gentleman would pursue those concerns on behalf of the minority in our party as vigorously as he pursued them on behalf of the minorities of his party.

To the majority leader, the DOD authorization bill will be on the floor, I understand, as the gentleman pointed out. Again, we have the same situation, as he knows. There are some extraordinarily controversial items included within this authorization bill. I might say to the leader some of these, as the gentleman knows, are issues which have been brought up within the last 30 days that make some of the most sweeping changes that have been made in the Civil Service System since its creation and exempt fully, when we include Homeland Security, one-half of the Federal employees from protections that they now enjoy under title 5, title 41 and other pieces of legislation passed by the House and the Senate.

In addition to that, as the gentleman knows, there are some very substantial questions with reference to environmental statutes that are on the book and possible exemptions from certain statutory requirements dealing with endangered species, dealing with clean air, dealing with other items.

Could the gentleman tell me the rule that is contemplated and whether or not amendments will be made in order, particularly those two items, and there may be multiple amendments, but whether or not there will be full consideration of those very controversial items?

I will tell the gentleman, as he knows, I have consistently, since 1981, supported authorization bills and am a strong supporter of defense, and I have always supported appropriations bills, but at the same time the fact that something is included in a bill, if no opportunity is given to debate those items which may be controversial as opposed to those items which are ensuring the strength of our country and the capability of our Armed Forces and the quality of life for our personnel, we do not want to have to vote against those, clearly, and probably will not. But we do want the opportunity to debate these very controversial items and to provide alternatives.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the Department of Defense authorization bill is a huge, huge piece of legislation, which includes providing for our national defense, fighting the war on terror, providing for the military and their families, particularly their quality of life. It is a very complicated, very important piece of legislation.

The gentleman is correct that some provisions were brought to some people's attention some 30 days ago, but